

I want to come back to a point perhaps I made a little earlier, and that is that it is very important not to paint all banks with the same brush with the kind of things I have been talking about tonight. There are many banks, and I have talked to many banks in my community, community banks who are very socially responsible. I have talked to a lot of bankers, particularly small town bankers, who have built banks on the trust of their communities, who have told me they are angry at some of their bigger brethren, frankly, for violating people's privacy, for exposing them to the ridicule of Congress and the American public on this subject.

Because those bankers understand very clearly that banks really are built on trust and that they do damage to their relationship with their customers if they violate that sense of trust. I think we are going to see more, in fact I know there is one bank in the next week or two in the State of Washington that is going to announce policies that are essentially what we are proposing. We are proposing that Americans have the right to advise their banks to provide them banking services but not to allow the use of those banking services for marketing purposes against them by some other affiliate or third party. That should not be too much to ask.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to say that we are on the cusp of a new dawn when it comes to financial services. We are at the eleventh hour, this is last chance we are going to have to ensure Americans their privacy. And while this bill, H.R. 10, may have sort of corralled one horse, the one horse that is involved in raiding our privacy, it has left 5 to 500 out of the corral. Because while it has helped on third-party privacy protection, it is going to create a whole new host of financial organizations. And they are going to be given the opportunity to violate our rights of privacy, to telemarket us at 7 o'clock at night.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to stand for any American in the next decade that gets a call at the dinner hour when they are trying to sell them a product using their checking account, their credit card, their Social Security number or other information. And I hope they do not call me at 6 o'clock to complain, because I am here tonight trying to get the U.S. Congress to prohibit that practice.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 73. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

#### SECURITY ISSUES RELATING TO RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLETCHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as I have done frequently in the past, I want to just talk this evening about a situation that occurred in a hearing this week relative to our relations with Russia.

The last time I addressed this body it was to focus on a new direction in our relations with Russia, a new set of eight principles that the factions of the state Duma had agreed with, allowing us to continue to provide investment and economic opportunity in Russia but to set some new guidelines. That bill, which I dropped approximately one month ago, had 25 Democrat and 25 Republican sponsors when I introduced it. We have now gotten additional support and, in fact, we are hoping to continue to grow the kind of movement in the Congress that says that in spite of Russia's economic problems, we must still be engaged but be engaged in a different way.

I rise tonight, however, Mr. Speaker, to discuss a security issue relative to Russia based on a set of hearings that I have conducted on my subcommittee over the past 5 years. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the highest ranking GRU defector ever from the former Soviet Union, Stanislav Lunev come before our Committee on Armed Services, and in a hearing that was open to the public, but in which hearing we had to hide his identity because he is in a witness protection program in this country, he testified about his role as a GRU agent and what his responsibilities were.

During that testimony, besides giving us an insight into the mindset of Soviet intelligence, he talked about what he thought may in fact continue to be some problems with our relationship with Russia today. One of the more troubling things that Lunev spoke of was when he was assigned to the Washington embassy of the former Soviet Union, under the cover of being a Tass correspondent, one of his primary responsibilities was to identify and locate potential sites for the drops and the location of sensitive Soviet military equipment and hardware that could be accessed in time of a conflict in the United States.

Now, we had no separate way of corroborating the testimony of Mr. Lunev at that time, yet these comments were made on the public record and were obviously of great concern to us. Well, this past summer something new happened, Mr. Speaker, and that was that the Cambridge scholar Christopher Andrew, who has written over 10 books, very scholarly books on intelligence operations around the world, and who

has specialized in the intelligence of the former Soviet Union and the current practices of the current intelligence operations inside of Russia, Christopher Andrew was able to get access to a series of files that have been given to the British Government.

□ 2000

For 6 years he worked on the files in a way that allowed him to produce a book last month which was the basis of the hearing that I chaired. I want to go through that because the testimony of Christopher Andrew reinforces what Stanislav Lunev had said in our committee hearing 2 years prior. Some very troubling information came out of that, and there is, I think, reason for us to move quickly.

I have written to Secretary Albright and hope tonight to dwell upon why I think it is important for the administration to act on the findings of Christopher Andrew in his book.

It seems as though, Mr. Speaker, that the head archivist for the KGB files in Moscow for a period of over 20 decades by the name of Mitrokhin did not like the kind of activities the KGB was involved in in the Soviet era.

During his tenure as the chief archivist, there was a decision made in Moscow to relocate the central files of the KGB from downtown Moscow to one of the Ring Road sites. Since Mitrokhin was in charge of the archives, his job was to monitor these archives and always keep them under his control. In fact, he oversaw the move of the files had to be checked out of the Moscow site and then checked in at the new site, both of which were done by Mitrokhin and people who worked for him.

Now, he had been recognized during his career as an outstanding public servant in the Soviet Union. In fact in the book, there is a photograph of the documentation awarded to him signed by the chief of the KGB praising him for the outstanding work he did on behalf of the Soviet Union.

But because Mitrokhin privately did not like many of the practices of the KGB, especially those individual attacks on people and the attacks on ethnic groups, he secretly during his career of over 2 decades on a daily basis copied down in his own handwriting as many of the KGB files as he could. Each day during his tenure as the head archivist of the KGB, he would then place these handwritten notes inside of his clothing, would sneak them out of the KGB headquarters, and on a daily basis put them under the flooring of his dacha. He did this for a number of years, assembling a huge file of handwritten notes that basically were copied from the KGB archives.

In 1992, after the reforms took place in Russia, Mitrokhin emigrated through one the three Baltic states. He initially went to an American embassy